

MANAGING PRISON POPULATION GROWTH, DELIVERING EFFECTIVE COMMUNITY-BASED CORRECTIONS AND TREATING DRUG-RELATED AND FEMALE OFFENDERS

*Laurence L. Motiuk**

INTRODUCTION

Criminal justice policy makers and practitioners have the lead role in managing prison populations, delivering community-based corrections and treating offenders. Because of the enormous social and economic costs to society, crime control continues to present a serious challenge for many countries. Internationally, changes in legal definitions coupled with reduced public tolerance for crime and focused media attention have led to increases in sanctioning - both custodial and non-custodial - of offenders over the last decade.

Realizing that the public, in general, does not fully understand the inner workings of the criminal justice system (Roberts, 1993), service providers are being called upon to provide accurate information on the care, custody, control and safe reintegration of offenders. Knowing also that the media has stretched public acceptance to the limit for any correctional failure means that service providers need to learn everything there is to know about effectively and efficiently managing prison population growth, delivering community-based corrections and treating special offender groups such as drug-related and female offenders.

To summarize - public opinion, staff and offenders exert significant influence over the realization of correctional objectives. In particular, the task of safely reducing the size of the prison population and returning drug-related and female offenders to the

community falls squarely of those working in correctional facilities and the community at large. Certainly, these people are being called upon to deliver more sophisticated services to a clientele constantly changing and for a public that is uncertain. Moreover, correctional staff and volunteers must do so in a safe, effective and cost efficient manner as possible. This, then, defines the problem statement for corrections - the care, custody, control and safe reintegration of offenders. The following paper provides background and a framework for this important work.

A. Managing Prison Population Growth

As constant as growth in the use of prison has been over recent decades, it is a commonly held notion that it will likely continue well into this century. In North America, roughly one-fifth of those under correctional supervision (2000 — 2 million in the United States and 34,000 in Canada) are in prison (growing at a rate of nearly 3% per year in the United States and declining at a rate of 3% per year in Canada). Although international trends indicate that there will likely be larger prison caseloads to manage (Walmsley, 1999), it is notable that Canada has begun to experience a recent decline in their prison population.

In Canada, the ten provinces are responsible for accused persons remanded to prison before trial, young offenders (under 18), probation, adult offenders sentenced to under two years incarceration and parole supervision in three provinces.

* Canada

115TH INTERNATIONAL TRAINING COURSE
VISITING EXPERTS' PAPERS

The federal government is responsible for adult offenders sentenced to two years or more prison and parole supervision. The National Parole Board decides conditional release for all federal offenders and provincial offenders in most provinces.

Between 1990-91 and 1992-93 the number of Provincial/Territorial prison admissions increased by 22.5%, from 207,946 to 245,746. Similarly, federal prison admissions increased 21.4% between 1990-91 and 1993-94 (peaking one year later than Provinces/Territories) from 4,646 to 5,642. The increase in admissions contributed in large measure to the rapid growth of the Canadian prison population in the 1990's. Moreover, the total actual-in prison population rose by 16% between 1990-91 and 1994-95 from 29,224 to 33,882. Because of this rapid growth in the prison population, the Federal/Provincial/Territorial Ministers responsible for Justice in Canada asked Deputy Ministers and Heads of Corrections to identify options to deal effectively with the growing prison population (Motiuk & Serin, 2000). A paper entitled 'Corrections Population Growth' was subsequently developed and presented to the Ministers in May 1996 with a set of eleven recommendations. Additional recommendations were made in the 'First Report on Progress' (CPG 1997).

Eleven recommendations made to assist in addressing correctional population growth throughout Canada were:

- 1) endorsing a shared statement of principles for the criminal justice system;
- 2) making greater use of diversion programs and other alternative measures;
- 3) de-incarcerating low-risk offenders;
- 4) increasing the use of charge screening;
- 5) making wider use of risk prediction/assessment techniques in Criminal Justice decision-making;

- 6) increasing the use of Restorative Justice and mediation approaches;
- 7) supporting Provincial conditional release recommendations to amend the Prisons and Reformatories Act for greater administrative flexibility;
- 8) better sharing information and technologies within the system;
- 9) better informing the public about criminal justice dynamics and issues;
- 10) testing innovative, traditional methods based on restoration and healing through Aboriginal justice and corrections pilot projects; and
- 11) working more co-operatively on programs and services through Federal/Provincial/Territorial pilot projects.

Additional recommendations included:

- 1) evaluating diversion programs to include a component on net-widening;
- 2) developing technology to assist with the integration of systems;
- 3) sharing research findings on program effectiveness; and
- 4) amending a principle contained in recommendation #1 - *"incarceration should be used primarily for the most serious offenders and offences where the sentencing objectives are public safety, security, deterrence or denunciation and alternatives to incarceration should be sought if safe and more effective community sanctions are appropriate and available"*.

These recommendations inspired the formation of numerous working groups at all levels of government across Canada. These people were tasked with designing, developing and implementing creative options to deal more effectively and efficiently with prison population growth. Another important step towards this objective was to gain a better understanding of the most important factors influencing the size of the prison

population.

Factors Influencing the Size of the Prison Population

Throughout the 1990s, Canadian crime control practices resulted in changes in criminal code, reporting of crime, court processing, sentencing and conditional release policy and practice. Aside from public policy for crime control and causal factors linked to crime (such as child poverty, family breakdown, poor education and unemployment), six major factors are seen to account for the size of the prison population. They are: 1) crime rates, 2) sanctioning (incarceration rates), 3) sentence lengths, 4) release policy and practice, 5) offender population profile and 6) successful reintegration/recidivism. Another important factor is the offender profile (such as number and variety of previous youth or adult convictions, escape history, personal characteristics, etc.) of the prison population.

The crime rate, particularly the type of crime and the extent to which offenders are sentenced to a period of incarceration are the main determinants of prison admission rates (see CSC 2000). In contrast to earlier periods, since 1991 the overall trend in the number of offences in Canada has been downward. In fact, between 1991 and 1998 there has been a 15% decrease in the overall number of offences reported by police. More importantly, since 1993, most categories of violent crime (homicide, sexual assaults and robbery) have also decreased. Although comparisons of European and North American imprisonment rates in 1997 show Canada to be relatively high (129 per 100,000 population), it is significantly below the United States (645 per 100,000). While there had been a notable increase in annual Canadian prisons admissions in the early 1990s, sentenced offenders admitted to Federal/Provincial/Territorial prisons have

been declining in recent years.

Sentence length and prison release policy/practice are two determinates of the average length of stay in prison. More specifically, sentence length determines not only how much time will be spent in a prison but also the earliest possible date for supervised release in the community. Corrections practitioners can impact on the average length of stay in prison by assisting in the selection and preparation of offenders for early release and contributing to their successful reintegration to the community with prescriptive intervention and appropriate supervision. Taken together, shortening the average length of stay of prisoners and reducing recidivism should result in a lowering of the size of the prison population.

Prison Population Management - Offender Reintegration

Offender reintegration can be defined as all activity and programming conducted to prepare an offender to return safely to the community as a law-abiding citizen (Thurber, 1998). Reintegration encompasses a broad range of decisions intended to: place offenders in the least restrictive setting possible, grant temporary absence or conditional release, and invoke suspension or revocation of conditional release when necessary (Motiuk & Serin, 1998). Correctional service providers can impact on the number of prison releases, the number of prisoners granted conditional releases, the number of offenders who remain incarcerated past their parole eligibility dates; and the number of cases who are not reviewed because they were not prepared in time. Therefore, safe, effective and efficient reintegration can yield fewer days spent in prison.

When there is a significant number of days less of incarceration for a prisoner this

has particular relevance for population management when accumulated over many cases. Sixteen reintegration levers are suggested considerable opportunity for impacting on the size of the prison population (Motiuk, 1998).

Reintegration Levers

1. Classifying Initial Security Level

Initial security level placement has an impact on the probability and timing of discretionary release.

2. Profiling reintegration potentia

Accurate profiles of each offender's release potential and post-release adjustment serves as a means to predict good candidates for early release and can help to establish case preparation priorities.

3. Developing Correctional Plans

The correctional plan is the foundation upon which prison release is predicated and often the basis on which discretionary release is supported or denied and often understood or have the tendency to become "binding contracts", especially when the plan is associated with a statement of reintegration potential.

4. Improving Program Motivation

Offenders who are highly motivated to succeed in programs represent prime candidates for successful reintegration. Motivation is often a critical factor in parole officer support for program referral, participation, progress and early release. Accurately assessing offender motivation to target offenders for program participation and to establish release priority can make an important contribution to safe reintegration.

5. Increasing Program Participation

Institutional program participation often consumes a large proportion of case preparation time and often becomes a major cause of delays in release. Successful

program participation has been demonstrated to improve the likelihood of post-release success. Indiscriminate assignment to programs, where the need is not identified or, the program is inappropriate, may offer no benefit or actually contribute to conditional release failure.

6. Ensuring Program Completion

Program participation is a critical foundation for the safe release of offenders. The full effects of programming are not always fully known, however, completing programs provides important information about post-release success; and program non-completers impose a cost both in terms of wasted resources and in depriving motivated offenders program opportunities.

7. Improving Program Performance

The assessment of program performance although critical in the decision to support early release, is often subjective and largely without guidelines. Assessing program outcome/gain or relating program performance to reintegration potential and post-release adjustment is important.

8. Referring for Preventative Detention

Increasing preventative detention referrals (to be held to the end of sentence) results in longer incarceration periods. Profiles of offenders who are returned to custody following detention can be established and provide the basis for improving detention referrals.

9. Moderating Segregation

Placement in segregation for disciplinary or administrative reasons is a major impediment to correctional progress and early release. Profiles of offenders identified as "at risk" to be segregated provide an opportunity to develop interventions designed to divert offenders from segregation and to ensure their quick discharge; effective implementation of

segregation policies can prevent the segregation of some offenders and ensure the speedy release of others.

10. Reclassifying Security Level

Reclassification and expeditious transfer of offenders to the "least restrictive measures of confinement" can improve the offender's chances for earlier, discretionary release.

11. Increasing Temporary Absence

Participation in either escorted or unescorted temporary absence programs are critical to establishing offender credibility for early release and re-establishing the temporary absence program can make a major contribution to safe reintegration.

12. Enhancing Case Preparation

Case preparation is the total of all activity designed to prepare appropriate offenders for early release and manage them throughout conditional release. Achieving modest efficiencies at any one of a number of critical stages along the case management continuum can result in significant reductions in "days of incarceration" and a corresponding increase in community supervision.

13. Encouraging Community Release

Participation in either work release or various types of early release programs (such as day parole, correctional halfway house placement, community correctional centres, attendance centres) are critical to establishing offender credibility for full release and re-establishing the view that this type of programming can make a major contribution to safe reintegration.

14. Enhancing Community Supervision

The effective use of minimum frequency of contact guidelines and special conditions can play an important role in determining whether offenders successfully complete their conditional release.

15. Reducing Suspensions

Reintegration success can also be achieved by maintaining conditionally released offenders in the community; predicting offenders who will be suspended is greatly improved by use of risk measurement techniques; and suspension practice is subject to broad interpretation, often reflecting local decision-making traditions and case management efficiencies that can impact on the reintegration progress.

16. Reducing Revocations

Technical revocations (those not based on a criminal conviction, charge or absconding from the parole jurisdiction) may provide a source for additional reintegration gain. There has been little study of decision-making processes and no technical revocation guidelines could be developed to support field staff; and a better understanding of the process and corporate guidelines, particularly that support alternatives to revocation submissions may offer additional reintegration gains.

Clearly, the number of reintegration levers presented offer mechanisms for reductions in incarceration days. Within this context, the aforementioned levers can also contribute substantially to the integrity of custody, care, control and safe reintegration practices and the success of prison population management.

**Prison Population Management -
Crime Reduction Through
Effective Treatment**

Research reviews on adult correctional treatment have found that correctional treatment is effective in reducing criminal recidivism. Recent studies on offender treatment have yielded overall average reductions of 10% in recidivism among treated offenders (Lozel, 1996). However, with appropriate interventions the results are more impressive - around 30%

reduction in recidivism (Gendreau & Goggin, 1996). Meta-analyses of adult and juvenile correctional interventions demonstrate that juvenile interventions are more effective than those designed for adults (Gaes, Flanigan, Motiuk & Stewart, 1999). While education, vocational training and prison labor programs were found to have modest effects on reducing criminal recidivism, they increased positive behavior in prison. Notwithstanding, studies on behavioral/cognitive treatments, on average, have produced larger effects of reducing recidivism than other treatments, Gendreau, Goggin, Cullen, and Andrews (2000) have noted that when it comes to reducing offender recidivism, the best approach is appropriate cognitive-behavioral treatments that embody known principles of effective intervention.

For reporting on crime reduction as a result of effective correctional treatment, the change and reduction in recidivism is calculated for program completers, participants and dropouts. The change and reduction (reported as the difference in recidivism rate over the comparison group - raises the overall magnitude of the effect) in recidivism is measured relative to either a matched comparison group, control group (sometimes waiting list controls) and or general base rate for a similarly situated correctional population. Accredited programs offered by the Correctional Service of Canada based on sound theory and research with therapeutic integrity report reductions in recidivism of 20% to 80% (CSC, 2000).

In sum, it is possible to manage prison population size through offender reintegration and crime reduction through effective treatment.

B. Delivering Effective Community-Based Corrections

Among the various factors that influence

public safety, there is considerable evidence that incarceration alone shows no success as a method of rehabilitating offenders. Without other forms of intervention which directly address criminal behavior and attempt to instill new patterns of behavior, prison on its own lacks promise. A major review of accumulated findings (Andrews, Zinger, Hoge, Bonta, Gendreau, & Cullen, 1990) provides clear evidence of the impotency of criminal sanctions when unaccompanied by appropriate rehabilitative programming.

More recently, Gendreau et al. (2000) examined over 103 comparisons of offenders who were either sent to prison for brief periods or received a community-based sanction. Basically, they found no deterrent effect from prison, but actually an increase in recidivism. The results of another meta-analytic review by Losel (1996) reports rehabilitation programming that takes place in prison settings is less effective than programming which occurs in the community. Consequently, the evidence suggests that better correctional outcomes can be obtained in the community.

There is also solid evidence supporting the premise that the gradual and structured release of offenders is the safest and most effective strategy for the protection of society against new offences. Post-release recidivism studies (Waller, 1974; Harman & Hann, 1986) have found that the percentage of safe returns to the community is higher for supervised offenders than those released with no supervision. Therefore, offender reintegration is seen as working to better prepare offenders for release and providing them with greater support once they are in the community. Reintegration efforts should yield dividends in terms of higher rates of safe return to the community and lower rates of criminal recidivism.

The public is concerned with who and how offenders are managed in the community, particularly those who are violent or repeat, because those providing supervision services are seen as being responsible for their safety. The fact remains most incarcerated offenders eventually return to the community and the majority of sentenced offenders are given non-custodial sentences. In fact, nearly four-fifths of offenders being managed by North American correctional authorities are in the community.

The best way, then, to serve the public is to recognize the risk presented by an individual, and to then put to good use the tools, the training and a fundamental understanding of what it really means to manage offender risk.

Risk Management Principles

Effective risk management in corrections implies that decisions are made using the best procedures available, and are in keeping with the overall goals of the system. For correctional service providers, the application of risk management principles to reducing the chance of criminal recidivism is all that is required to develop an effective risk management program (or to improve on an already existing one). These risk management principles (Motiuk, 1995) include:

- 1) the assessment of risk;
- 2) the sharing of information (communication);
- 3) the monitoring of activities (evaluation); and
- 4) if deemed appropriate, an intervention (incapacitation, programming).

Public safety is improved whenever these risk management activities are integrated into every function and level of the correctional system providing care and control.

Assessment Methods

In practice, the analysis of offender risk serves to structure many of the decisions made with respect to supervision requirements and program placement. The key to risk assessment is to be able to make decisions after having considered all of the available information. However, the capacity to conduct formalized risk assessments is directly related to the amount of resources a correctional agency has at its disposal.

Andrews, Bonta, and Hoge (1990) have presented a number of principles to aid in the classification of offenders to promote effective rehabilitation. These include the “risk”, “need”, “responsivity” and “professional override” or discretion. The “risk” principle proposes that the more intensive correctional interventions are best applied with higher risk offenders (those who have a higher probability for negative correctional outcomes) while less intensive interventions should be reserved for lower risk offenders. The “need” principle proposes that when offender needs are targeted well and interventions applied to meet those needs, then we should expect a reduction in the amount of recidivism. The “responsivity” principle proposes that an offender’s learning style should be matched with the appropriate method of service delivery. Finally, the “professional override” principle asserts that after having considered “risk”, “need” and “responsivity”, case workers exercise judgment in treating a particular offender.

Previous research by Motiuk and Porporino (1989) on the predictive value of community-based offender risk assessments found that:

- 1) criminal history factors are strongly related to community supervision outcome;
- 2) a consistent relationship exists between the type and number of needs

115TH INTERNATIONAL TRAINING COURSE
VISITING EXPERTS' PAPERS

- that offenders present (unemployment, substance abuse) and the likelihood of their re-offending and, most importantly,
- 3) the combined assessment of the level of both risk and needs significantly improves our ability to predict who is likely to re-offend and who will.

Static risk factors refer to criminal history background such number and variety of criminal convictions, breaches of trust (escape, breach of probation) and exposure/response to the criminal justice system (previous probation and/or incarceration, placement in disciplinary segregation). Dynamic risk factors refer to case needs or criminogenic needs that are capable of reflecting change in an individual (Andrews et al., 1990). This is a critical component of not only offender risk assessment, but also of risk management because this is where intervention takes place.

Little can be done about static factors (e.g., criminal record or criminal history). There is, however, considerable predictive power in those variables. While criminal history should not be ignored, you cannot do much to change those variables; this is where dynamic risk factors come in. These dynamic risk factors (or case needs) are considered to be a sub-set of overall risk. The goal is to effectively target these factors and apply appropriate interventions to have an impact on the likelihood of a criminal future.

Using this conceptual framework is very helpful for community corrections as it allows one to vary frequency of contact, level of supervision or amount of service to be delivered if people do change. It is also helpful, as there is a mechanism to demonstrate that an offender has changed. This situation has resulted in a conceptual shift in community-based corrections

towards a thorough examination of offender needs as a set of dynamic risk factors, thereby allowing some flexibility in service delivery.

As part of the standards for community supervision (Correctional Service of Canada/National Parole Board), parole officers are required to use a systematic approach to assess the needs of offenders, their risk of re-offending and any other factors which might affect successful reintegration to the community. In keeping with this standard, a 'Community Intervention Scale' (formerly called the Community Risk/Needs Management Scale) is used to capture case-specific information on 'criminal history' and a critical set of 'needs' for classification (employment, marital/family relations, associates/social interaction, substance abuse, community functioning, personal/emotional orientation, and attitude) while on conditional release (Motiuk, 1997).

The Community Intervention Scale is systematically administered and re-administered to all offenders under community supervision by case managers across Canada. It provides an efficient system for recording criminal history risk and case needs, level of risk and need, required frequency of contact, and related background information on each offender (i.e., release status, warrant expiry). More importantly, the Community Intervention Scale assists community staff in managing sex offender risk. For example, the process of suspension of conditional release that may or may not lead to a revocation is one possible measure that can be used to assure that the level of risk is acceptable.

To sum, this dynamic assessment method serves to instruct community-based service providers with important information. More specifically, with whom they are dealing, what they are like, what

kinds of problems they faced out in the community before they became in conflict with the law, and what kind of problems they experience while under supervision. Such information can also help direct limited resources to particular segments of the population under community supervision to reduce risk.

Supervision Standards

Standards in community-based corrections usually affirm many traditional community supervision practices. They also transform correctional services into publicly acknowledged performance criteria. For example, community supervision standards might include the following: Agency Mission Statement and Services, Basic Policy Information, Information Sharing, Officer Selection, Training, and Workload, Case Planning, Case Conferencing and Documentation, Initial and Ongoing Contact with the Offender and Others in The Community, Violation and Suspension, Police Liaison, 24 Hour Availability, Agency Policies, Volunteers who provide supervision services, Offender Files, and Community Services and Resources (CSC, 1989).

For community-based corrections, the aforementioned standards introduce standardized methods of risk assessment and case planning, promote uniform decision-making, and clearly define areas of discretion. Luciani (1994) found that compliance with standards are vital to preserving the integrity of supervision and promoting a professional ethic.

Focused research on compliance with community supervision standards has found from audit exercises a number of keys to success (Luciani, 1994). First and foremost, those community offices with entrenched supervision practices that would survive an audit exercise (as opposed to achieving immediate compliance) fared

much better than those who had not. Secondly, community offices managed by those who had established clear operational standards, routinely monitored work, and rejected substandard performance showed the most improvement. Finally, community offices whose field staff coordinated their efforts towards achieving standards performance received the highest ratings.

Correctional plans determine the how, what and why of community supervision. It is important to ensure that the plan is relevant to the individual's criminality, specific and understood by them, feasible, decent, humane, and legal. The release plan should focus upon: 1) reviewing dynamic risk factors and criminal patterns, 2) addressing concerns of the releasing authorities, 3) establishing short and long term goals and objectives of supervision, and 4) reviewing treatment programs, resources and supervision techniques.

Finally, a critical source of control and assistance resides in the quality of the interpersonal relationship between the offender and other involved workers in the community (Andrews, 1995). More specifically, the style and mode of communication is very important in the context of supervision, particularly in terms of interaction with different types of cases. For example, chronically depressed individuals may not respond well to highly confrontational exchanges. Other specific responsivity considerations encompass gender, age, intelligence and ethnicity.

When an offender's risk to the community is increased, the monitoring and assistance functions of supervision can be enhanced through disciplinary interviews and increased frequency of contact. Under certain conditions, when the increased risk level of the offender is no longer manageable, a suspension may

be in order (Motiuk & Brown, 1993). These situations include undue risk of a breach and/or re-offending; a breach of special or additional conditions (i.e., curfews, not to associate, abstain, etc.); and inability to assess risk because of failure to report.

In sum, careful attention to dynamic risk assessment or problem identification and monitoring are the keys to successful community-based supervision and intervention. A good community supervision plan will include elements aimed at avoiding high-risk situations (i.e., social patterns, locale, drug use) and building in added social support for compliance and active participation in the plan.

C. Treating Drug-related and Female Offenders

Fueled by public concerns for community safety and demands for new measures to allay those concerns, the international corrections community is being challenged to respond with conceptual and methodological advances in treatment for special offender groups. Although jurisdictions may vary in the risk/need profiles of their offenders and the proportion of special groups in their respective correctional population, there may be sufficient range in these groups to suggest developing differentiated treatment strategies. The United Nations Asian and Far East Institute (2000) requested that this paper address issues related to treating drug-related and female offenders.

Drug-related Offenders

In North America, alcohol and drug abuse affects millions of people. Surveys on the prevalence of substance use disorders estimate that around 14% of adults have experienced Alcohol Dependence at some time in their lives, with approximately 7% having had

Dependence in the last year. Due to the variety of drugs that could be included in large-scale surveys on Drug Dependence, reliable estimates of prevalence are difficult to obtain. However, it is believed that the prevalence of drug abuse is on the same scale as alcohol abuse.

Surveys of correctional populations find that significant proportions have substance abuse problems. Consistently, studies of prison samples show more than two-thirds evidence some degree of substance abuse problems. Recently, the Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics conducted a census of prisoners in all adult correctional facilities across Canada. Although substance abuse was the highest need area identified among Provincial/Territorial prisoners (less than 2 years), it was higher for federal inmates. In addition, substance abuse problems (such as intoxication, trafficking and importation) among the prison population was the most frequently identified security concern.

The high prevalence of drug abuse among criminal offenders indicates a strong association between substance abuse and various types of crime (Dowden & Brown, 1998). Alcohol is suspected of contributing to the loss of ability to control aggressive behavior. Some illicit drugs such as cocaine may elicit paranoid thoughts that lead to aggressive acts. Furthermore, obtaining the money to purchase drugs often involves criminal activity. Although the particular nature of the association is not clear, substance abuse has been found to be associated with violent acts among adults and young offenders.

Substance abuse has been especially implicated in murders. Moreover, substance abuse is a well-established predictor of recidivism among sexual offenders and mentally disordered offenders.

In relation to treatment, there is strong empirical support for the assertion that effective treatment of drug abuse reduces crime (Andrews & Bonta, 1998). Average reductions in recidivism of 30% have been reported in effectiveness studies of drug abuse and appropriate treatment. A recent outcome evaluation of Correctional Service of Canada's substance abuse programs in 1999 found a 31% reduction in new convictions for 2,432 federal offenders who completed the Offender Substance Abuse Pre-release Program.

Drug-related offender subgroups have different risk/need profiles and are mostly comprised of property, assaultive and robbery offenders in correctional systems. Antisocial associates, relationship to the offender and circumstance regarding their contact have been found to be very important dynamic risk factors to consider for drug-related offenders. For the most part, drug-related offenders present an elevated risk for re-offence.

However, there are a number of risk factors that are not unique to drug-related offenders but which are associated with re-offence: previous offenses, substance abuse, criminal associates, and antisocial attitudes. Risk factors unique to drug-related offenders include: early age of onset, family supervision/affection, scholastic/vocational maladjustment, and self-control.

Drug Abuse Programs for Offenders

Offenders with drug abuse problems differ in terms of: the etiology of the abuse, presentation of the problem, its specific relation to criminality, and their response to treatment (Lightfoot, 1995). Fundamental to effective intervention is the matching of offenders to the most appropriate intervention, although higher risk offenders with greater severity of abuse typically require more intensive

intervention.

A recent review of the literature (Serin, 2000) would reveal that there are six essential components of an effective drug abuse program for offenders. These include the following: 1) assessment, 2) pre-treatment motivational analysis, 3) formal treatment, 4) relapse prevention, 5) maintenance and 6) evaluation.

Assessment. Identifying the range and severity of treatment needs, conducting client selection for a program; doing a functional analysis of use of alcohol and drugs and their relation to criminality; determining the role of alcohol and drugs in the offenders' use of violence, identifying treatment goals (abstinence or self-control/moderation); matching offender to program alternatives; conducting pre/post-treatment assessments of needs, knowledge and skills; and finally, doing follow-up re-assessments during maintenance phase.

Pre-treatment motivational analysis. Assessing prior treatment experience and performance (not just for drug abuse); developing a motivational strategy consistent with needs or stage of readiness; considering obstacles to successful program completion; establishing support system for maintaining treatment gains; and considering the role of therapeutic communities in facilitating treatment.

Formal treatment. Using accepted adult learning strategies, addressing treatment needs as identified in assessment phase; focusing on knowledge and skill acquisition using various procedures, incorporating teaching aids and presenting materials at the appropriate level; and considering group and individual sessions to enhance treatment performance.

Treatment targets for substance abuse

115TH INTERNATIONAL TRAINING COURSE
VISITING EXPERTS' PAPERS

programs typically include most or all of the following: (from the Correctional Service Canada's Offender Substance Abuse Pre-release Program manual) orientation, alcohol and drug education, self-management training, social skills training, job skills, leisure and lifestyle, pre-release planning, and relapse prevention.

Relapse prevention. Identifying offense cycle and markers for relapse; considering resilience factors and skill acquisition regarding Relapse Prevention; practicing coping with high risk situations of increasing difficulty; and establishing a plan for maintaining treatment goals.

Maintenance. Identifying and developing support systems to maintain treatment gains; considering treatment boosters to maintain gain; establishing continuity of care in release planning; and determining the role of special conditions such as urinalysis and post-release intervention.

Evaluation. Establishing intermediate measures of treatment gain (reduced levels of substance use while incarcerated, fewer institutional misconducts related to drug abuse); calculating change scores for each offender on knowledge and skills relating to treatment targets; rating offenders' performance in the program; gathering satisfaction ratings (offenders, unit staff, nursing, correctional staff, parole officer, psychology); following up on drop-outs and refusals in evaluation of effectiveness; finding out the impact of other treatment program involvement; and comparing with a control group or cohort.

Female Offenders

Female offender subgroups also have different risk/need profiles with property, drug and sex trade offenders most common in correctional systems (Motiuk, 1999). The social context, relationship to female

offender and circumstance regarding their contact are very important to consider. For the most part, female offenders present the lowest risk for re-offence.

There are a number of risk factors that are not unique to female offenders but which are associated with re-offence: previous offenses, substance abuse, family breakdown, marital problems, education/employment difficulties, and criminal associates. Risk factors unique to female offenders include: histories of trauma, victimization, parenting responsibilities, physical and mental health problems, and poverty.

Clinical measures of capacity for relatedness and connection are important in determining treatment responsivity of a female offender (Bloom, 1999). In keeping with general principles of effective treatment it remains important to match risk/need profiles to intervention intensity levels (Andrews & Dowden, 1999). Offenses committed by females are not usually impulsive acts. Consequently, gender responsive programming for female offenders should be delivered in a woman-centered environment that is safe, trusting and supportive (Stableforth, 1999).

Women-centered Programs

Current assessment and classification paradigms are composites or reformulations of what is known about variables pertaining to female offender risk and need (Motiuk & Blanchette, 1998). Comprehensive evaluation strategies for female offenders are paramount for appropriate security placement, prescribing treatment, and risk management. There is growing evidence that the objective assessment instruments used in Canadian corrections are both reliable and valid for female offenders (Motiuk & Nafekh, 1999). While current assessment tools appear to be accurate in

identifying static and dynamic variables for female offenders, there is room for improvement.

Dowden and Blanchette (1999) found that drug abusing female offenders tend to: start their criminal careers at an earlier age; have previous adult court experience; possess histories of breaches of trust (escape, unlawfully at large) and placements in disciplinary segregation; be classified as high need; and experience difficulties in associates/social interaction, attitudes, employment, and marital/family relations. Their research also suggests that substance abuse problems are not unidimensional and interact with a number of criminogenic need areas. Clearly, reliable differences exist between female offender substance abusers and non-abusers in a variety of areas. Examples of women-centered programs offered by the Correctional Service of Canada include: Mother-child program (children (0 - 12) visitation or full- and part-time residency program); Anger and Emotions Management; Women's Substance Abuse Program (a substance abuse program that meets the needs of women); Empowerment Group for Women; Anti-fraud; Anti-criminal Thinking; Cognitive Skills Training (to think in non-criminal ways); Canine Program (introduces women to the basics of dog grooming and training); Native Sisterhood (provides support to Native and Non-Native women in Native culture, particularly in relation to Native craft and livelihood skills); Parenting Skills Program (a short general education program); Survivors of Abuse and Trauma Programming (education/ awareness; intensive group therapy, post-program support); Peer Support (intensive training women inmates to provide emotional support to their peers); and Dialectical Behavior Therapy (a cognitive behavioral treatment program for borderline personality disorder).

CONCLUSION

Corrections has always been about people, not just numbers. State-of-the-art offender assessment tools, treatment programs, and practice guidelines or standards are helpful. But unless an organization's people, at all levels, are committed to both effective and efficient correctional service delivery (custody, care, control and safe reintegration), and supportive of various initiatives, within their respective jurisdictions, corrections will be unable to move forward into the future.

REFERENCES

- Andrews, D.A. (1995). The psychology of criminal conduct and effective treatment. In J. McGuire (Ed.) What Works? Reducing Reoffending. (pp.35-62). New York: Wiley.
- Andrews, D.A., & Bonta, J. (1998). The psychology of criminal conduct. Second Edition. Cincinnati: Anderson.
- Andrews, D.A., Bonta, J. & Hoge, R.D. (1990). Classification for effective rehabilitation: Rediscovering psychology. Criminal Justice and Behavior, 17, 19-52.
- Andrews, D.A. & Dowden, C. (1999). A meta-analytic investigation into effective correctional intervention for female offenders. Forum on Corrections Research, 11(3), 18-21.
- Andrews, D.A., Zinger, I., Hoge, R.D., Bonta, J., Gendreau, P., & Cullen, F. (1990). Does correctional treatment work? A clinically relevant and psychologically informed meta-analysis. Criminology, 28, 369-404.
- Bloom, B. (1999). Gender-responsive programming for women offender: Guiding principles and practices. Forum on Corrections Research, 11(3), 22-27.

115TH INTERNATIONAL TRAINING COURSE
VISITING EXPERTS' PAPERS

- Boland, F., Henderson, K., & Baker, J. (1998). Substance abuse assessment review. Forum on Corrections Research, 10(3), 32-34.
- Corrections Population Growth. (1997). First report on progress for Federal/Provincial/Territorial Ministers responsible for justice. Fredricton, New Brunswick.
- Correctional Service Canada (2000). The safe return of offenders to the community. (April 2000). Research Branch, CSC.
- Dowden, C., & Blanchette, K. (1999). An investigation into the characteristics of substance abusing women offenders: Risk, need and post-release outcome. Report No. 81. Research Branch, Correctional Service of Canada.
- Dowden, C., & Brown, S. (1998). Substance abuse. Forum on Corrections Research, 10(3), 28-31.
- Gaes, G., Flanigan, T., Motiuk, L.L., & Stewart, L. (1999). Adult correctional treatment. In Prisons. (M. Tonry & J. Petersilia, Eds). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Gendreau, P., & Goggin, C. (1996). Principles of effective correctional programming. Forum on Corrections Research, 8(3), 38-41.
- Gendreau, P., Goggin, C., Cullen, F.T., & Andrews, D.A. (2000). The effects of community sanctions and incarceration on recidivism. Forum on Corrections Research, 12(2), 10-13.
- Harman, W.G., & Hann, R.G. (1986). Predicting general release risk for penitentiary inmates. User report. Ministry of the Solicitor General of Canada, No. 1986-32.
- Lightfoot, L.O. (1995). Assessment and treatment of substance abuse in offenders: Practice guidelines for correctional psychologists. In Leis, T.A., Motiuk, L.L., & Ogloff, J.R. (Eds.). Forensic Psychology: Policy and Practice in Corrections. Ottawa: Correctional Service Canada.
- Lozel, F. (1996). Effective correctional programming: What empirical research tells us and what it doesn't. Forum on Corrections Research, 8(3), 33-37.
- Luciani, F. (1994). Conditional release supervision standards revisited: An examination of compliance in Ontario Region. Forum on Corrections Research, 6(3), 26-29.
- Motiuk, L.L. (1995). Refocusing the role of psychology in risk management: Assessment, communication, monitoring and intervention. In Leis, T.A., Motiuk, L.L., & Ogloff, J.R. (Eds.). Forensic Psychology: Policy and Practice in Corrections. Ottawa: Correctional Service Canada.
- Motiuk, L.L. (1997). The Community Risk/Needs Management Scale: An effective supervision tools. Forum on Corrections Research, 9(1), 8-12.
- Motiuk, L.L., (1998). 16 levers for reintegration. A published paper presented at the National Parole Board - Correctional service of Canada Retreat. Waskesiu, Saskatchewan.
- Motiuk, L.L. (1999). Special offender risk/needs groups: Youthful offenders, female offenders and foreign nationals. A published paper presented at the International Roundtable on Corrections. Oslo, Norway.
- Motiuk, L.L., & Blanchette, K. (1998). What works: Assessments for women. A

RESOURCE MATERIAL SERIES No. 57

published paper presented at the International Community Corrections Association 6th Annual Research Conference. Arlington, Virginia.

Motiuk, L.L., & Brown, S. (1993). The validity of offender needs identification and analysis in community corrections. Report No. 34. Research and Statistics Branch, Correctional Service of Canada.

Motiuk, L.L., & Nafekh, M. (1999). Reintegration potential profiles for federally sentenced women. Forum on Corrections Research, 11(3): 13-17.

Motiuk, L.L., & Porporino, F. (1989). Field tests of the Community Risk/Needs Management Scale: A study of offenders on caseload. Report No. 6. Research and Statistics Branch, Correctional Service Canada.

Motiuk, L.L., and Serin, R. (1998). Situating risk assessment in the reintegration potential framework. Forum on Corrections Research, 10(1): 19-22.

Motiuk, L.L., and Serin, R. (2000). A compendium on "what works" in offender programming. Forum on Corrections Research, 12(2): 19-22.

Roberts, J. (1993). Risk management: The views of the public and the challenges to corrections. Forum on Corrections Research, 5(2), 19-21.

Stableforth, N.L. (1999). Effective corrections for women offender. Forum on Corrections Research, 11(3), 3-5.

Serin, R. (2000). Personal communication.

Thurber, A. (1998). Understanding offender reintegration. Forum on Corrections Research, 10(1): 14-19.

Waller, I. (1974). Men Released from Prison. Centre of Criminology, University of Toronto Press.

Walmsley, R. (1999). World Prison Population List. Home Office Research, Development and Statistics Directorate.